

Serial No. 09/744,046

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-8 have been amended.

Claims 1, 3-5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arbeiter in view of Seidler. The examiner states that Arbeiter discloses a bicycle shift mechanism comprising a housing having an opening configured to receive a control cable but does not disclose a closure member having an extension, a thickened portion, a molded recess, an upper lip and a lower lip wherein said upper lip and said lower lip engage an edge of said opening. Further, the examiner states, however, Seidler discloses a closure member made of elastic material having a thickened extension extending into a housing, a hinge; an upper lip which rests over the edge of an installation opening; and a lower lip sliding under the edge of the installation opening. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The cited references do not contain any suggestion, express or implied, that they be combined. Nor can there be as Seidler is from a nonanalogous art field. The present invention describes an access panel formed in a shifter housing containing an internally routed cable, the panel providing access to the cable without requiring disassembly of the shifter or manipulation of the container. Seidler merely discloses one piece 12 of a two-piece container 12, 14, similar to a suitcase or clamshell, contrarily teaching that access can only be achieved by manipulation of the container itself. Accordingly, one having ordinary skill in the art would not look to the Seidler art field for a solution to the problem solved by the present invention. Therefore, the obviousness rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 3-5 and 7 were rejected as claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Since claims 3-5 and 7 depend directly or indirectly from and contain all the limitations of


Serial No. 09/744,046

claim 1 as amended, they are felt to overcome the obviousness rejection in the same manner as amended claim 1.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arbeiter in view of Seidler as applied to claims 1, 3-5 and 7 and further in view of Robbins et al. Since claim 6 depends from and contains all the limitations of claim 1 as amended, it is felt to overcome the obviousness rejection in the same manner as amended claim 1.

This amendment is believed to be fully responsive to the comments and suggestions of the Examiner and to place this application in condition for allowance. Favorable action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,
ROBERT WESSEL


Lisa J. Wunderlich, Attorney
Registration No. 40,307
SRAM Corporation
1333 N. Kingsbury, 4th Floor
Chicago, IL 60622
(312) 664-8800 ext. 1393